

Abuse by Priests, Homosexuality, *Humanae vitae*, and a Crisis of Masculinity in the Church

Gerard J.M. van den Aardweg, Ph.D.

Dr. van den Aardweg is a psychotherapist with a Ph.D. in psychology. He has widely published on homosexuality and homosexual pedophilia, including three books in the U.S.

Abstract

*Data on the age of the preferred partner of same-sex attracted men show that the abuse of minors by priests and deacons is primarily a question of “ordinary” homosexuality, and secondarily of homosexual pedophilia (not just unspecified “pedophilia”). This points to the substantial over-representation of homosexually inclined men among seminarians and priests, which in turn is related to a process of “homosexualization” (and feminization) in the Church. The general dissent from the moral doctrine on sexuality and marriage (as set forth in the encyclical *Humanae vitae*) has paved the way for this process. A few suggestions are discussed for the prevention of the abuses of the past decades: (a) improved screening of candidates for the priesthood as well as for the office of bishop on masculine personality maturity, which includes normal heterosexuality and fatherhood qualities; (b) a spiritual regime for seminary students and priests that is demanding on the self and directs the battle for holiness; (c) appointment of bishops and seminary regents who are active apostles of *Humanae vitae* and *Evangelium vitae*.*

The Mediocre John Jay College Report

The much discussed John Jay College report on sexual abuse of minors by the American clergy (and deacons) up to 2002 confirmed what

was long known to many insiders, but could hardly be believed by many common Catholics: cases of molestation of children and (pre-)adolescents by priests, deacons, and friars were far from exceptional; and many bishops, superiors of religious orders, and other Church authorities did not take appropriate action.¹ On the whole, however, the report, an analysis of questionnaire responses given by Church agencies on the basis of their registers of complaints against the clergy, does little more than scratch the surface of the problem. It presents a global impression of the complaints, but how exactly this reflects the extent of clergy abuse remains open. For example, no attempts have been made to check the validity of the complaints in a few small random samples, or to approximate the possible number of trustworthy but never reported incidents. Thus, objectively, the situation may have been (and may still be) better or worse. Either way, the report is exact with respect to registered complaints, but on many points rather vague concerning the perpetrators.²

The statistics in the report are sometimes confusing because they lack sufficient specificity. For example, the 5-percent index for the diocesan priests between 1960 and 1996 against whom allegations of abuse were made—or the 4.3 percent of diocesan priests and 2.5 percent of religious priests between 1950 and 2002—is the result of lumping all sorts of allegations together: from one-time incidents like touching the breasts of a girl of seventeen by a young priest in his twenties to repeated oral sex with boys under age twelve. Very serious and relatively mild offenses are averaged, and, as everything is labeled “child sexual abuse,” the reader who is not used to analyzing graphs and tables may get the impression that perhaps 5 percent, one in twenty, priests are “pedophiles,” dangerous for children. The report makes few distinctions. It does not distinguish between various types of offenders, and does not describe offender profiles. Over half of the priests, 56 percent, were accused of one offense. However, what kind of offense? If it were preponderantly one from the less serious categories, the picture of the average “child abusing” priest would be less bleak than the overall impression created by the report.

Another point: 3 percent of the accused were involved in ten or more cases of molestation, but they accounted for 26 percent of all alleged incidents. The image of the fictitious average offender is a bit less somber if this 3 percent, evidently a distinct subgroup, is not factored in. The same applies for the spread of the abuses over the dioceses. The finding that in some dioceses “only” 2.5 percent of the priests were accused, in others 7 percent, almost three times as much, cries for further exploration, just as for similarly striking differences between religious communities. Why has no attempt been made to search after the distinguishing factors, comparing the best with the worst dioceses and communities? It is precisely this kind of information that is useful for prevention.

Statistics are offered on the sex and age of the alleged victims, but important information is missing. The number or percentage of priests,

religious, and deacons who allegedly had exclusively molested girls under age twelve, or of those who exclusively molested boys under age twelve, or of those who molested boys as well as girls under age twelve is not mentioned in the report. That might provide an important clue as to the percentage of real pedophile priests, including homosexual, bisexual, and heterosexual pedophiles. Neither has information been made available regarding the equally important question of the number or percentage of priests who were exclusively accused of molesting female adolescents, exclusively accused of molesting male adolescents, or adolescents of both sexes. Thus, the question about the number or percentage of heterosexual *ephebophiles* as set against homosexual and bisexual *ephebophiles* is unresolved (*ephebophilia*: sexual attraction to adolescents and pre-adolescents). And what is the percentage of those accused of both perversions, i.e., of abusing adolescents as well as children under age twelve? These questions are not merely of academic interest. Their answers are directly relevant for the screening of seminarians, deacons, and priests. This is an enormous oversight of the report, and severely limits the conclusions that can be drawn from the data contained therein.

As was to be expected, the peak years of sexual abuse of minors by priests, etc., in the U.S. seem to lie more than twenty years in the past. Largely through external pressure, Church authorities have meanwhile taken or proposed measures for reparation and prevention, but not all that is necessary has been said and done. One important issue has evaded the limelight: homosexuality. The John Jay report certainly deserves credit as a contribution to the discussion in the Church. But its greatest flaw is to present its (rather undifferentiated) statistics and comments as if it is all about some isolated phenomenon: “child” sexual abuse. But the vast majority of these children were pre-adolescent and adolescent boys, not girls, which incontrovertibly points to homosexuality (see below); and the great majority of the child-victims proper (under age eleven) were boys—and that points to pedophile homosexuality. Nor has mention been made of the sex of the victims of the 3 percent of those accused who are thought responsible for 26 percent of all incidents. These 3 percent were accused of twenty offenses on average, which again suggests the pedophile variant of homosexuality, in the first place because approximately 85 percent of the perpetrating priests had molested boys and homosexual, not heterosexual, pedophiles are most likely to have such large numbers of victims.³

Why this obfuscation of the homosexuality factor? Were the authors insufficiently familiar with the varieties of homosexual behavior, or reluctant to openly contradict the politically correct axiom that “homosexuals are no more liable to abuse children and minors than heterosexuals”? Their numbers, if not their words, contradicted the axiom, in any case. I criticize this looking away from the homosexuality topic because, this way, the false media notion that “priests are pedophiles”

was not corrected and the Church authorities were not urged to put the finger on the sour spot: homosexuality within the Church. As long as this issue is not clarified and effectively addressed, chances are that despite the decrease of minor abuse by priests resulting from the revelation of the scandals and the accompanying social pressure, men with same-sex attraction (SSA) will seek other outlets, including behaviors that are objectively abusive but not forbidden by law (consensual sex, sex with peers, upward shift of the age of seduced young partners).⁴

“Priests Are Pedophiles” and a Historical Example of Reporting Bias

It is abundantly clear that justice must be done to all parties involved in sexual abuse, first of all to the victims. However, the reporting of these cases in the mass media raises another issue of justice that is owed to the priesthood, the pope, and Catholicism in general. Allegations in many cases have been treated as facts, without solid investigation and proper evaluation. It is interesting to note that this sort of bias in reporting sexual abuse by the Catholic priesthood is not a new phenomenon, but has in fact been done before.

The representation of priestly abuse as “pedophilia,” which is particularly popular in the media in countries such as Holland, Germany, and Italy, is unfair. Equally unfair is the selective media attention for the abuse of minors within the Catholic Church. The whole thing is thus largely reduced to a specific evil of priesthood and exploited as an effective propaganda item in a campaign against a Church and pope whose doctrine on sexual morality, abortion, and euthanasia is hated by the liberal media and, at least in Europe, by the political and social establishment. To picture “pedophilia” as a priesthood-related evil has the additional advantage of keeping homosexuality out of sight. For the danger exists that in the wake of the Catholic scandals attention will be drawn to the decades-long efforts to normalize pedophile homosexuality by the gay movement and directly or indirectly by the media and political parties in support of it—precisely the circles that now cry out against the Catholic Church and the pope. This hypocrisy has a historical precedent.

Enraged by the repeated denunciation of the racial doctrine by Pope Pius XI, and even more by his anti-Nazism encyclical *Mit brennender Sorge* (*With Burning Anguish*, 1937), Hitler ordered the persecution of all and every Catholic priest and religious who could be accused of the least homosexual behavior, which at the time was punishable by law in all Western nations. The obvious objective was defamation of the Catholic Church. Propaganda minister Goebbels was instructed to intensively publish the so-called “morality processes” (“Sittlichkeitsprozessen”), hammering home a Pavlovian association between the concepts “priests” and “homosexuals.” In a speech in 1937,

Hitler himself exclaimed that, “many priests” and “almost all religious priests are homosexuals.” Goebbels acquitted himself well of his job, his diary witnesses to his enjoying it (“It will be a nice game drive,” “It was a nice hell’s concerto”).⁵ Surely, the campaign then was more brutal than now, but there are several parallels: then as now the guilt of the accused was a foregone conclusion. Then as now all possible registers (at the time, of the police) were scoured for incriminating evidence, no matter how long ago the alleged offense had taken place. Then as now it was Catholic priests who were singled out for the purge; and then as now the political and social establishment that spurred on the media campaign was itself responsible for much aberrant sexual abuse.⁶ Also in Hitler’s time, the great majority of the offenses concerned minors, but the term “pedophilia” was not yet in use and all male-to-male contacts were designated “homosexuality.” At present, the word “homosexuality” is carefully avoided, as being politically correct does not allow that it be used any more to incite public opinion against the accused—so now it is “pedophilia.” But the hypocrisy of many loudly indignant public accusers today is similar to that of the Nazi publicity at the time, for just as the latter accusers practiced and promoted homosexuality and pederasty in their own party—and in the Hitler Youth—those of today come from the quarters of society which are most responsible for the liberalization of homosexual behavior and breaking the taboos on sex with minors.

A recent book documents the propaganda in Germany since the late sixties through leftist political parties, the Greens in the forefront, prominent national and local politicians, the influential humanist organizations, and the media, not only for the normalization of homosexuality but also of sex with children, mostly homo-sex.⁷ In February 1985 the parliamentary fraction of the Greens came up with the draft of a bill to abolish the laws for protection of minors. The existing rules would

threaten consenting sexual contacts with punishment and therefore do not serve to protect sexual self-determination. They impede the free deployment of personality. . . . The threat of punishment burdens the conflict-free experience of those youngsters who are already sure of their sexual orientation.⁸

Germany’s most prestigious sex reformers and sex educators until the 90s, men such as the openly gay university professors (social scientists) Rüdiger Lautmann and Helmut Kentler, the foremost counselors of State agencies and the (Lutheran) Evangelical church, intensively advocated sex with children and normalization of homosexual pedophilia. They influenced the obligatory State programs of school sexual education in this direction. All this created an atmosphere where authorities and the—predominantly leftist—media looked away from sexual excesses involving minors in humanist, leftist, and liberal quarters.⁹ Significantly, the recent revelations about the “Odenwald school scandal,” a prestigious leftist-humanist “reform-pedagogical” institute led by “sexually

enlightened” teachers, did not create nearly the political and media indignation caused by the Catholic scandals. In fact, this institute was almost a pedophile/ephebophile homosexual brothel where pubescent children and adolescents were systematically forced to have sex with teachers, sometimes for years on end. Thousands of pupils are said to have been abused, more than all alleged cases of priests in the whole of Germany during the same period.¹⁰

Most Abuse of Minors: Ordinary and Pedophile Homosexuality

This is not to say that all public indignation because of the clergy scandals is also hypocritical. Many within and without the Church are grieved and angry because their trust in the priesthood and the Church hierarchy has been deeply abused. The scandals are the symptom of moral decadence in the whole Church. Confining the problem to “pedophilia in the priesthood” would leave the root causes out, and hence, uncured. These roots go deep.

The terminology used in the “morality processes” against priests in Nazi Germany was more realistic than in the present anti-Catholic campaign. At the time the priests were—probably in many cases, falsely—depicted as “homosexual.” Today this word is taboo in the context of abuse and replaced by “pedophile.” Yet the great majority of the alleged abuse cases are of an unmistakable homosexual nature. In spite of the reluctance and—still—unbelief in various sections of the Church bureaucracy and hierarchy to acknowledge this reality, one of the main underlying causes of the abuse was the degree of homosexualization of the priesthood. Let us first look again at some John Jay statistics.¹¹ Fully 81.7 percent of all incidents (1950–2002) involved boys from childhood to late adolescence; 12 percent boys under age eleven, 6.6 percent girls. If these molestations were committed by men with pedophile interests—which is plausible, sexually normal men do not seek sex with kids—12 percent of the offenses could be classified as homosexual (or bisexual) pedophilia and 6.6 percent as either bisexual or heterosexual pedophilia. The percentages of pedophilia-related incidents however may rise if many of the victims in the 11–14 year category were also molested by pedophiles. 41.6 percent of all complaints concerned boys in this age category, 7 percent girls. The question is how many of these boys had not yet entered the initial phase of puberty at the time of the offense. Many eleven-year-old boys probably had not, as opposed to the majority of the older boys. The point is that the average homosexual pedophile is not attracted anymore to boys manifesting the first signs of manhood; usually the upper limit of pedophile interests is pinpointed around age eleven. Now under the assumption that about one third of these boys aged 11–14 years might have been approached by homosexual pedophiles, theoretically about 25 percent of all complaints might have involved a homosexual pedophile.¹² (However, the percentage of

ephebophile offenders of 11–14-year-old boys may have been higher; see below). In any case, of all the incidents with victims of both sexes, minimally 49 percent must be attributed to non-pedophile homosexuals, ephebophiles, and androphiles (men interested in young or more mature men). And minimally 60 percent of all cases involved male victims. Add to this that the percentage of male victims between 15–17 years at the first molestation constantly went up from 18 percent in the fifties to 55 percent in the nineties.¹³ Obviously, the major problem is homosexuality, the minor problem homosexual pedophilia. And the latter orientation is closely related to “ordinary” homosexuality. As it is, “homosexuality” consists of various more or less overlapping syndromes; and in particular some ephebophile (adolescent-directed) homosexuals may also be interested in same-sex children.¹⁴

Preferred Homosexual Partner Age

Insight into the preferred age of homosexual partners helps to understand better the “homosexualities” mentioned above, the variants of male same-sex attraction, in their mutual relationships. Otherwise, upper and lower limits of the age of the preferred partner do not imply that a person with SSA will not occasionally cross them and either seek or accept an older or younger partner. The best data available were collected sixty years ago by H. Giese in Germany and K. Freund in Czechoslovakia in large samples of practicing, socially adapted male homosexuals, therapy clients, and sex offenders.¹⁵ Their studies confirm one another on practically all key points, and the general picture that emerges seems the same as today. One outstanding fact is that the age range of the “ideal” partner in 65–80 percent of men with SSA hardly alters over a lifetime, and therefore is very much fixed. Specifically, 3–5 percent of the men felt attracted to boys up to age twelve: the pedophiles. The preferred partner for about 20 percent was between thirteen and twenty years old: the ephebophiles; for another 20 percent between seventeen and twenty to thirty years old: a mixed group of ephebophiles and androphiles (men attracted to—mostly young—adult men).¹⁶ 35 percent preferred a partner not younger than 20–25 years: the androphiles; by contrast, for only 12 percent the partner should be over twenty-five years.¹⁷ Only about 10 percent wanted a partner above age forty. This was in line with the finding that the partner of those who at the time of the inquiry had a “steady” affair was, in nearly 60 percent, a younger man, only in 30 percent an older man. In 23 percent 10–20 years younger, in 12 percent more than twenty-one years; in merely 11 percent, 11–20 years older and in 3.5 percent more than twenty-one years older.¹⁸ Simplifying a bit, 20 percent preferred adolescents and preadolescents, and 20 percent juveniles in late adolescence plus young adults, so 40 percent had more or less ephebophilic tendencies. Apart from the 5 percent pedophiles, the rest, some 55 percent, preferred an adult man between twenty and forty years old, rather seldom an older one. In short,

a majority of men with SSA focus on adolescents and young adults: for 63 percent, the ideal partner was a minor under twenty-one, while the most popular age range was 20–27 years.¹⁹

According to a recent American small-sample study even 80 percent of practicing homosexuals preferred a partner between fifteen and twenty years.²⁰ In sum, the studies provide evidence for several types of SSA, which however are not clear-cut and show considerable overlap. Comparing this to the foregoing statistics on abuse of minors by priests, the probability is high that the bulk of the incidents were caused by priests who belong to the ephebophile variant of SSA and to the mixed group of ephebophiles and androphiles.

Regarding the part of homosexual pedophiles in the scandals, the following considerations are pertinent. In conformity with clinical experience, male, homosexual pedophiles do not often cross the upper age limit of about eleven years, whereas the lower age boundary of homosexual ephebophiles, about thirteen or fourteen years, seems less impermeable. Freund found some experimental indications for this in a small-sample study.²¹ Plethysmographic measurement of erotic excitation in response to pictures of naked young boys, adolescents, and mature men suggested that self-identified ephebophile homosexuals responded most to (pictures of) adolescents, but also to mature males and, to a degree, to 9–11-year-old boys; androphiles reacted not only to pictures of mature men but also of adolescents. Homosexual pedophiles responded most to boys aged five through eight, less to 9–11-year-old boys, and not significantly to adolescents. Thus ephebophile and androphile interests were not far apart on the one hand, whereas ephebophile interests could spill over to interest in young boys. (Ephebophiles had elevated responses to boys aged 9–11, so it is likely that their responses to those aged 12–13 are even more pronounced). The same is suggested by other indications. Of a random sample of active homosexual men in San Francisco, 23 percent admitted one or more sexual experiences with a minor under sixteen (the statutory age) when they themselves were at least twenty-one²²; 22 percent of adult “gays” in another study reported the same, whereas 30 percent said they were “open” to contacts with boys under sixteen.²³ This may be chiefly the ephebophile subgroup; sometimes also an ephebophile male client in treatment notices that on occasion, he may feel some attraction to younger boys. It is probable that if the still-existing social taboo on sexual contacts with children would disappear, many ephebophile men would become more interested in younger boys.

Oscar Wilde and his lover Alfred Douglas, both ephebophile homosexuals, are a case in point. At his trial (1895), Wilde was forced to admit contacts with young men and adolescents older than sixteen, the statutory age, after first flatly denying everything. But just weeks before, in Algeria, outside the constraints of the Western world, he arranged for two boys of about 11–12 years, one for his friend André Gide, an exclusive

pedophile, one for himself. Douglas traveled around with two Arab boys aged twelve.²⁴ And after his imprisonment, away from England, Wilde continued cruising for young men, adolescents, and younger boys.²⁵

Homosexual pedophilia proper has little overlap with ephebophilia and androphilia as to partner preference. It is also true that many “average” homosexuals distance themselves from pedophiles. But many despise the effeminate types too (these seem overrepresented in the minority group of androphiles preferring older, mature men, see above). As to so-called homosexual “transsexuals,” homosexual investigator Bailey is rightly considering them another “type of gay men.”²⁶ All are branches from the same tree. Psychologically, their lowest common denominator is a lack of healthy male physical aggressiveness, much more than “feminine identification.”²⁷ That all variants share the trait of compulsive partner seeking and promiscuity needs hardly further substantiation.²⁸ Their psychological, childhood-background factors are very similar as well: too little positive father influence together with too much mother influence at their upbringing (many variants), and, statistically the most significant: isolation from same-sex and -age mates in childhood and/or pre-adolescence.²⁹

Finally, the “gay movement” itself has from the outset seen homosexual pedophilia as just one of the “homosexualities.” In the Netherlands, for example, homosexual pedophiles have always played a prominent role in the movement’s leadership. Only when it was tactically inept to sell it to the public as normal was no mention of pedophile homosexuality made, but after the social acceptance of “ordinary” homosexuality in the 80s, its normalization was openly advocated. Referring to the official Dutch gay organization, T. Sandfort asserted: “By acknowledging the affinity between homosexuality and pedophilia [the organization] broadened *gay identity*.”³⁰ Applying all this to the abuse of minors in the Church, the conclusion must be that even if up to a quarter of the cases would involve “real” pedophilia—only a minority of them, heterosexual—the scandals are overwhelmingly an expression of homosexuality among the priesthood.

Abuse of Young Men; Prevalence of SSA Priests and Seminarians

The percentage of homosexually abusing priests is higher when molestations of over-seventeen-year-old men, especially in seminaries and theological institutes, are taken into account. Seminarians are sometimes groomed, emotionally pressured by priests who are persons of authority. Homosexual seducers can be skilled in bringing a naive young man under their spell, and their cunning and insolence may intimidate the victim.³¹ Some possess a real “charisma” of seduction. In general, active homosexual men pose a much greater risk of seduction than heterosexual men. While at most 2–3 percent of the male population are homosexually oriented,³² 20–40 percent of child and minor sexual molestations are homosexual; hence the probability that the average

homosexual man molests a minor is 10–20 times higher than that of the average heterosexual man.³³ Of the sexual abuses by foster fathers reported for 1997–2002 by the Illinois child services, 14 percent involved an adoptive boy (2–3 percent would be expected); another study gave a higher percentage.³⁴ Regarding same-sex molestation of (young) adult men, a military statistic is indicative: 10 percent of sexual assaults in the military (2007–2009) were homosexual, 4–5 times more than expected if 2–3 percent of the military are homosexual.³⁵ As for priests (and seminarians), even if as many as 20 percent were attracted to boys and adolescents (1950–2002), these produced four times more abuses than their heterosexual colleagues.

The prevalence of homosexual tendencies among seminarians and priests is considerably higher than the national average. Thomas Plante, a psychologist screening American seminarians, estimated 20–40 percent.³⁶ Some ex-residents of seminaries and theological institutes believed up to half of the students and several faculty members had same-sex tendencies.³⁷ These may seem impressionistic over-estimations, but the reality in some institutes and communities helps substantiate these impressions. For example, two percent of the clergy of the city of São Paulo (27 out of 1,500) died of AIDS between 1987 and 1993.³⁸ At that time, homosexual and bisexual exposure in Brazil accounted for over half of AIDS cases (where the route of exposure was known)³⁹; and there were over four hundred cases of “men who have sex with other men” for every case of AIDS.⁴⁰ Thus, the number of homosexually *active* priests must have been considerably higher than the 2 percent incidence of homosexuality. After thorough examination of the scandals at the Austrian Sankt Pölten seminary in 2004, only ten of forty seminarians were allowed to continue their studies. Though it was not about homosexual misbehavior alone, “a considerable number of persons were homosexual,” as the visitor declared afterwards.⁴¹ Typically, the misconduct started in a homosexual ring. The same year, the novice master of the Jesuits in Nuremberg openly affirmed the existence in German seminaries and religious communities of “homosexual hierarchies” that created “power structures and dependencies.”⁴² “Intentionally and unintentionally,” there appear to be homosexual “rings” or networks in the Church “up to the highest circles,” according to Professor Hubert Windisch, pastoral theologian at the University of Freiburg.⁴³ Similar situations existed in the Netherlands, also in orthodox, “conservative” seminaries.⁴⁴ Because of the phenomenon of homosexuals “flocking together,”⁴⁵ a high prevalence of men with SSA in certain institutes or dioceses is not indicative of the average prevalence. These observations are probably especially valid for countries in the sphere of influence of Western culture. Many men with SSA do not abuse minors, but either seek partners among adult young men within or without Church circles, or seldom or never act out their feelings—the latter is probably a small minority.⁴⁶ Overall, a prevalence estimation of 10–15 percent is on the conservative side. In the last decade, the trend seems slowly downward.

Homosexualization in the Church

The elevated prevalence of SSA among priests, religious, and deacons reflects a degree of “homosexualization” within the Church. More important than whether 10 or 20 percent of the clergy is affected is that many inwardly justify them, and that these men seem disproportionately represented on the higher levels of the Church bureaucracy and in the hierarchy. Twelve U.S. bishops and a not negligible number of other higher functionaries were featured in the John Jay report; homosexual abuses and misconduct by bishops are known as well in Holland, Belgium, Italy, Poland, Brazil, Austria, Germany, etc. More bishops, abbots, moral theologians, and priests in key functions in dioceses have SSA than is publicly known, and it is very likely that some of them also hold key positions in the administration of the Church.⁴⁷ According to a number of priest-representatives of Brazilian dioceses, the gay colleagues they knew well were often eager to get the better and higher positions, the richer parishes; they profited from their intelligence, sociability, charming manners, flattering of the mighty, and from a certain dishonesty and duplicity to climb the ladder of their career.⁴⁸

Much of this sketch is recognizable in other parts of the ecclesiastical world. Even many of those who are abstinent may have vague or dubious opinions on homosexuality and Church doctrine on sexuality and marriage in general. Those who rationalize their orientation and participate in coteries work subversively in that they protect or further the ecclesiastical career of like-oriented colleagues and subordinates, favor writings or pastoral programs of a direct or indirect pro-homosexual tenor, and disfavor publications, nominations, or measures unwelcome to gay sensitivities. Besides the pro-gay pressure from the secular world, this factor too is responsible for the absorption of key elements of the gay ideology in the policy and pastoral documents of several national conferences of bishops on homosexuality, key elements which include same-sex inclined people are victims of incomprehension and discrimination, they are born that way or at least cannot change (“*be cured*”), the causes of their condition are unknown (mystification of the issue); and their talents make them particularly suited for the priesthood.⁴⁹ Essentially gay ideas wrapped in the pious, compassionate language of charity have an impact on the many Christians who do not see through them. In Italy, for example, the gay-minded writings of a priest, Domenico Pezzini, are highly praised by many of his colleagues.⁵⁰

Thus while the wave of homosexual abuses in the Church ebbs away, the pro-gay mentality is not a thing of the past. Still rare are the bishops who dare openly teach and defend the Church’s doctrine on immoral sexual behavior, or speak out against the injustice of the legalization of same-sex “marriage” and child adoption. To the contrary, some appear to protect gay-friendly sex education in their diocese.⁵¹ In the few cases a European bishop writes or declares something critical about the gay agenda and he does not back down upon the vehement media reactions, he is practically

left alone by his colleagues. No sooner had a good, apostolic priest become nominated as auxiliary bishop of Linz, Austria, in 2009, than he was assaulted from all sides, including from within the Church, for having expressed in the past his orthodox moral view of homosexuality. Faced with this violent storm, the majority of the bishops capitulated and forced him to withdraw. Examples abound. Whether the archbishop of Milan disagrees with their activities or out of fear for gay reactions, he did not even want to receive the leadership of a generous Catholic aid group for SSA people in the line of the American group Courage. And so on.

With the ubiquitous gay propaganda, and with lack of honest enlightenment about the real scientific facts and Christian morality on homosexuality, and, more seriously, of a consistent Christian sexuality and marriage education by their priests and bishops, the resistance of Catholics against the gay ideology is dwindling. Their acceptance of same-sex “marriage” in the U.S., following the European pattern, has multiplied during the last decade (60 percent now agree).⁵² This is understandable, since the majority of Catholics are no more familiar with the notion of chastity and so live contraceptively like the secular world around them. Why would they be “intolerant” with people “born” with different tastes?

Homosexualization on the Bandwagon of *Humanae vitae* Dissent

Neither the extent of homosexual abuses by the clergy, the relatively high percentage of SSA priests, nor the absorption of at least parts of the gay ideology in broad sectors of the Church would have been thinkable without the generalized rejection of *Humanae vitae*. Although the abandonment by priests and lay people of the Christian moral doctrine of sexuality and marriage had started years before the encyclical, since 1968 it became open and structural. Heterosexual behavior unrelated to procreation was morally normalized, and this was bound to facilitate acceptance of other sterile sexual relations. Moral theologians and bishops manifestly or covertly dissented; celibacy was seen as antiquated.⁵³ The “cheerful religion” foretold by blessed John Henry Newman was on the upsurge,⁵⁴ sexual sin, Confession, penance, mortification, self-sacrifice, and the Last Things seemed abolished. For most men given to same-sex attractions, it is hard enough to resist at all; but given the atmosphere of *Humanae vitae* dissent, debate over celibacy, and feeling justified by theological advocates of “faithful” same-sex relations, many succumbed at moments of personal disillusionment or loneliness.⁵⁵

The less demanding, softer ways of the post-war Church partly explain why relatively many homosexually inclined and otherwise-less-masculine personality types felt attracted to the priesthood and religious life. Masculinity, male authority, and the father role became undervalued, also in the Church, together with a growing feminization of liturgical and other functions. In its totality, it was an attractive climate for men with defective psychic maleness. But apart from these more tempo-

rary psychosocial factors, homosexually inclined men have always been attracted to sacral roles and functions. This phenomenon is of all times and most cultures. Homosexual or effeminate men have been priests in pagan cults, and they are also overrepresented in most Protestant denominations as pastors, ministers, or bishops, and in their theological schools.⁵⁶ As for the Catholic Church, the problem of homosexual priests is not new. We have of course no statistics from the past, but during certain periods homosexual behavior and misconduct by priests and religious was not uncommon. For example, the *Visio Wettini* (of 824), written by the learned teacher of Charlemagne, warns that “everywhere vigilance must be exercised lest the house of God be changed into a temple of demons by the crime of sodomy.”⁵⁷ St. Peter Damian is known for his fight against priestly homosexuality in the eleventh century; in the *Dialogue* of Catherine of Siena in the middle of the fourteenth century, God the Father complains to the saint over priests who commit “the cursed sins against nature . . . religious and clerics, prelates and inferiors.”⁵⁸ I speculate that for many same-sex attracted men, the role of priest, minister, or rabbi, (probably too, imam) appeals to their immature narcissism, need of admiration and sympathy, and because it seems soft, easy, not requiring manly fighting spirit and competition. What they interpret as a religious vocation is often in large part narcissistic emotionalism. This may sound somewhat harsh to people who have come to know certain homosexually oriented seminarians or priests as gentle, nice personalities, but it nevertheless appears to be correct on closer analysis of the roots of the feeling of being called. To substantiate this assessment is, however, beyond the scope of this article.

Promoting a More Masculine Priesthood

To prevent future abuses by the clergy, homosexual or heterosexual, with minors or adults, it is imperative that the instruction of the Congregation for Catholic Education on the admission of same-sex attracted men to the priesthood be implemented: emotionally and sexually immature men, e.g., men with “deep-seated” homosexual tendencies should not be admitted.⁵⁹ However, for bishops and seminary regents who do not wholeheartedly endorse the spirit of the document or are naive in this respect, there is still ample room for flexibility. The “deep-seatedness” of this propensity is very often underestimated. Even though it sometimes happens that young men having clear same-sex feelings for several years, after a profound conversion and the adoption of a firm spiritual lifestyle, radically changed for at least five years, including restoration of heterosexual interests and fantasies,⁶⁰ this is very rare.

To avoid problems, applicants for the seminary—and all the more, the priesthood—should be exclusively heterosexually interested, and therapy or other measures to overcome same-sex attractions must take place before admission to a seminary or theological institute, not after-

wards. An apparently mild same-sex inclination in a (young) man who lives chastely and is a sympathetic, pious person is not a good argument for admitting him to a seminary; for it is unpredictable how this candidate will develop in the long run as a priest, and how he will react under stress. Besides, some who take in everyone by the good impression they make are dishonest, or belie themselves. "When the bishop asked me if I was abstinent, I said 'yes,'" a Dutch seminarian told a colleague who wrestled with the same problem.⁶¹ Some candidates for the priesthood take this attitude. Feigning, playing the "orthodox" role, unreliability, and lying to themselves are personality traits in not a few men with SSA who cherish their feelings to some extent, e.g., in masturbation fantasies. And same-sex interests are not isolated peculiarities but part of a specific variant of emotional instability or immaturity: underdeveloped psychic maleness.⁶² Frequently, this implies softness to self; lack of firmness and perseverance; a need to please or get attention; unsuitability for exerting authority and guiding people; self-centeredness, oversensitivity, neurotic and relational problems.

Pope Benedict XVI once said: "Christ needs priests who are mature, virile, capable of cultivating an authentic spiritual fatherhood." He pointed out that the way to holiness spurs "the growth of affective maturity."⁶³ Had seminary students since the 50s been personally coached in exercising the virtues and fighting their vices, in the practice of mortifications and of regular Confession, the percentage of sexually problematic and other immature priests would never have become so high, because most of them would not have held out with such a regime for five years. The consistent battle for holiness automatically works as a selection screen.

What is valid for the selection of candidates for the priesthood should be all the more valid for the selection of bishops. Homosexually inclined as well as other overly soft, timid, defensive, unmanly types of bishops and prelates are like weak fathers whose children grow up without guidance, support, and correction. A central criterion for the screening of bishops and seminary regents should be a solid pro-*Humanae vitae* mentality. These men are responsible for the education of the priests who must preach and explain the whole Christian doctrine on sexuality and marriage and coach the faithful along that line. Seminaries and dioceses under bishops who are (not merely verbally) zealous for *Humanae vitae* and *Evangelium vitae* automatically purge themselves from homosexualizing influences. Consequently the probability that they will be plagued by sex scandals among the clergy is considerably reduced.

Notes

¹ John Jay College of Criminal Justice, *The Nature and Scope of the Problem of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests and Deacons in the U.S.* (Washington, D.C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2004).

² Questionnaire studies do not yield nearly the results of the more toilsome, but scientifically more valuable research methods such as direct examination in representative samples of the facts and of the persons involved. In a study such as the one by the John Jay College, everything depends on the quality of the information in Church registers. Very probably, that will vary considerably. For example, what is the exactitude of many statements by (alleged) victims, their parents, or others regarding the minor's age at the time of molestation? In recalling the age some important event took place in their life, many people err by one or a few years. This so-called "recall bias" is well known in social-science research.

³ For example, recidivism of male homosexual pedophiles is twice that of male heterosexual pedophiles. See J.W. Mohr et al., *Pedophilia and Exhibitionism: A Handbook* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964).

⁴ Otherwise, the sharp decrease in allegations of minor abuse after 1985 as evidenced in John Jay College of Criminal Justice, *The Nature and Scope of the Problem*, need not necessarily imply an equally drastic improvement of the situation. Reasons for this are, first, because it cannot be excluded that the eventual number of allegations for the last decades will rise by 25%, as argued in the report; second, because the practical opportunity of minor abuse by priests, friars, etc. has diminished since many Catholic educational institutes have closed down (this is certainly true for western Europe).

⁵ Quotes of Hitler and of Joseph Goebbels's *Diary*, 4.26 and 4.30 (1937), in G. May, *Kirchenkampf oder Katholikenverfolgung? (Battle between Churches or Persecution of Catholics?)* (Stein am Rhein, Switzerland: Christiana Verlag, 1991), 351.

⁶ The higher echelons of the Nazi party and the Hitler Youth teemed with sexual abnormals, mostly homosexuals and homosexual abusers of boys. Hitler surrounded himself with many homosexual men, and the idea that the horrible "Roehm purge" started a persecution of homosexuals is largely a myth (S. Lively and K. Abrams, *The Pink Swastika* [Keizer, OR: Founders Publishing Corporation, 1995]). S. Igra, in *Germany's National Vice* (London: Quality Press, 1945), believes there is evidence that Hitler prostituted himself homosexually in Vienna and Munich; but although sexually deranged, he himself probably had no same-sex attractions.

⁷ A. Späth and M. Aden, *Die missbrauchte Republik (The Abused Republic)* (London/Hamburg: Inspiration Un Limited, 2010).

⁸ *Ibid.*, 77. The same year, the caucus of the Greens of the important "Land" (federal State) of Nordrhein-Westphalen decided to include legalization of pedophile contacts in their party program, in behalf of those "who want violence-free sex with children, are capable of it, and whose entire existence is destroyed overnight when it is known that they engaged in relationships which all of us must consider pleasant, productive, developmentally stimulating, in short: positive for both parties" (*ibid.*, 79). The decision was cancelled as it met with resistance from rank and file party members; but directly and indirectly, the party continued working on the destruction of the normal family and sexual norms. It greatly contributed to the abolition of all criminalization of homosexual acts (1994), adoption of the principle of "gender mainstreaming" by the

State (1999), legalization of “homo marriage” (2001), and legalization of prostitution (2001). *Ibid.*, 42.

⁹ Influential leftist politician Daniel Cohn-Bendit, well-known former student leader and a prominent member of the Euro-Parliament, wrote a book in 1975 in which he described his sexual “experiences” with kindergarten children (Späth and Aden, *Die missbrauchte Republik*, 80).

¹⁰ A quarter of the teachers were involved. Some of them, well-known names with an academic grade in pedagogy or respected evangelical theologians, are even charged with several thousands of “incidents” including repeated rape; they had developed a mind-boggling, refined system of manipulation and sexual tyranny. The director of the institute, one of the worst perpetrators, was protected by socially influential people (details in Späth and Aden, *Die missbrauchte Republik*, 112–124).

¹¹ Percentages in the text are deduced from John Jay College of Criminal Justice, *The Nature and Scope of the Problem*, table 3.5.4.

¹² The numerically and psychologically important 11–14 year category in John Jay College of Criminal Justice, *The Nature and Scope of the Problem*, should have been broken down into the three subcategories of 11-, 12-, and 13-year-olds; now interesting information may be blurred by putting too much in one basket. Besides, the important information on the number of offenders per age category is missing so that a better calculated estimate of the percentage of (homosexual) pedophiles is not possible. Some victim categories may have involved relatively few offenders—remember the 3% of offenders who accounted for 26% of all incidents.

¹³ John Jay College of Criminal Justice, *The Nature and Scope of the Problem*, table 3.5.5.

¹⁴ Hence, male molesters of adolescent boys are sometimes also charged with molesting young boys (K. Freund et al., “Heterosexual Interest in Homosexual Males,” *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 4 [1975]: 509–517). In another study, almost 90% of molesters against male children self-identified as “homosexual” or “bisexual” (W.D. Erickson et al., “Behavior Patterns of Child Molesters,” *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 17 [1986]: 77–86). Even exclusive pedophiles such as the most prominent homosexual-pedophilia advocate André Gide consider themselves as “homosexuals” (J. Delay, *La jeunesse d’André Gide*, vol. 2 [Paris: NRF Gallimard, 1956], 334). Though it is true that male homosexual pedophiles are focused on under-puberty boys, they may perceive pubescent individuals with only minor secondary sex characteristics as still children; moreover, they may have weak erotic interests in adolescents (W.L. Marshall et al., “Sexual Offenders Against Male Children: Sexual preferences,” *Behavior Research and Therapy* 26 [1988]: 383–398). On top of that, the characteristic psychological childhood and personality factors of homosexual pedophiles are roughly the same as those of “chronic homosexuals,” but not of heterosexual pedophiles (Mohr et al., *Pedophilia and Exhibitionism*). The common psychogenetic factor in the various types of SSA is a gender-inferiority complex (lack of gender identification) dating from childhood and adolescence; the differentiation regarding age of preferred partners depends on the age the prehomosexual felt not-belonging to his (her) same-sex peers and the nature of the ensuing fantasies

(G.J.M. van den Aardweg, *On the Origins and Treatment of Homosexuality* [New York: Praeger/Westport, 1986]).

¹⁵ H. Giese, *Der homosexuelle Mann in der Welt* (*The Homosexual Man in the World*) (Stuttgart: Enke, 1958); K. Freund, *Die Homosexualität beim Mann* (*Homosexuality in the Male*) (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1963). Freund moved to Canada, where he conducted research on homosexuality at the Clarke Institute of Psychiatry, Toronto.

¹⁶ Freund, *Die Homosexualität beim Mann*.

¹⁷ Giese, *Der homosexuelle Mann*; Freund, *Die Homosexualität beim Mann*.

¹⁸ Giese, *Der homosexuelle Mann*.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ A. Zebulun et al., "Sexual Partner Age Preferences of Homosexual and Heterosexual Men and Women," *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 29 (2000): 67–76.

²¹ Freund et al., "Heterosexual Interest in Homosexual Males." It is questionable if Freund's penile blood volume measurement is really that exact, apart from ethical and esthetic objections.

²² A.P. Bell and M.S. Weinberg, *Homosexualities* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1978).

²³ K. Jay and A. Young, *The Gay Report* (New York: Summit, 1979).

²⁴ Delay, *La jeunesse d'André Gide*, 456–458.

²⁵ H. Montgomery Hyde, *Oscar Wilde* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1975), 347; R. Ellmann, *Oscar Wilde* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1987), 735.

²⁶ J.M. Bailey, *The Man Who Would Be Queen* (Washington, D.C.: Joseph Henry Press, 2003).

²⁷ K. Freund and L. Blanchard, "Feminine Gender Identity and Physical Aggressiveness in Heterosexual and Homosexual Pedophiles," *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy* 13 (1987): 25–33, is one of many studies to show evidence of this.

²⁸ M.T. Saghir and E. Robins, *Male and Female Homosexuality: A Comprehensive Investigation* (Baltimore, MD: Williams and Wilkins, 1973); P. Blumstein and P. Schwartz, *American Couples: Money, Work, Sex* (New York: Morrow, 1983); D. McWhirter and A. Mattison, *The Male Couple* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1984); M. Dannecker, *Homosexuelle Männer und AIDS: Eine sexualwissenschaftliche Studie zu Sexualverhalten und Lebensstil* (*Homosexual Men and AIDS: A Sexological Study on Sexual Behavior and Lifestyle*) (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1990); M. Xiridou et al., "The Contribution of Steady and Casual Partnerships to the Incidence of HIV Infection Among Homosexual Men in Amsterdam," *AIDS* 17 (2003): 1029–1038 (the best statistical sample: Dutch male gay couples had on average 6 other sex partners per year; their average relation lasted 1.5 years); R.M. Grant et al., "Preexposure Chemoprophylaxis for HIV Prevention in Men Who Have Sex with Men," *New England Journal of Medicine* 363 (2010): 2587–2599 (random-selected HIV-negative homosexuals and transsexuals averaged 18 partners per 3 months). Compulsiveness/promiscuity also explains the enormously disproportionate incidence of homosexual vs. heterosexual molestation of youngsters (more than 15 times as much; P. Cameron, *The Gay Nineties* [Franklin, TN: Adroit Press, 1993], 66) and the higher average

number of victims of male homosexual pedophiles as compared with heterosexual pedophiles and their higher rate of recidivism (Mohr et al., *Pedophilia and Exhibitionism*; also K. Freund and R.J. Watson, "The Proportions of Heterosexual and Homosexual Pedophiles Among Sex Offenders Against Children," *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy* 18 [1992]: 34–43).

²⁹ I compiled the many studies demonstrating these factors until 1985; afterwards, the evidence has only become stronger.

³⁰ T. Sandfort, "Pedophilia and the Gay Movement," *Journal of Homosexuality* 7 (1987): 89–110, emphasis added.

³¹ Several such cases are known to this author. In one the perpetrator was a bishop. The terribly long process of recognition of the offenses by the founder of the Legionaries of Christ must be remembered as a warning lesson against well-intentioned, however objectively unjust, attempts on the part of ecclesiastical authorities to cover up such scandals without taking appropriate measures, and against naive unbelief in sincere, factual allegations.

³² Claims of a higher prevalence of homosexual tendencies notwithstanding, the methodologically best research shows remarkably lower percentages than are touted by the pro-gay media. The last such study is the British survey by the Office of National Statistics, *Integrated Household Survey* (2010), <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-11398629>, based on a national sample of over 200,000 persons: 1.3% of the male respondents from age 16 self-identified as "homosexual," .3% as "bisexual"; of the females, .6% and .7%, respectively.

³³ Cameron, *The Gay Nineties*, 60 ff.

³⁴ P. Cameron, "Homosexual Child Molestations by Foster Parents: Illinois," *Psychological Reports* 96 (2005): 227–230.

³⁵ *Family Research Report* (Colorado Springs, CO: Family Research Institute, 2010).

³⁶ David van Biema, "Screening the Priests," *Time* 166.16 (October 17, 2005): 57–58.

³⁷ Personal communications from men in a few West European countries and the U.S. (some date back twenty years).

³⁸ G. Nasini, *Um espinho na carne (A Thorn in the Flesh)* (Aparecida, São Paulo, Brazil: Editora Santuário, 2003), 81.

³⁹ D.A. Meira, "Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome in Brazil," *Croatian Medical Journal* 43 (2002): table 5.

⁴⁰ M.G. Fonseca and F.I. Bastos, "Twenty-Five Years of the AIDS Epidemic in Brazil: Principal Epidemiological Findings, 1980–2005," *Cadernos Saúde Pública* 23.supp 3 (2007): table 1.

⁴¹ Stephan Baier, "Beträchtliche Zahl Homosexueller," *Die Tagespost* (Germany), September 4, 2004, 6.

⁴² Katholische Nachrichten Agentur (KNA), "Jesuit bestätigt homosexuelle Hierarchien," *Die Tagespost*, August 24, 2004.

⁴³ Hubert Windisch, "Homo-Seilschaften? Bis in höchstste Kirchenkreise!," *Die Tagespost*, August 2, 2003.

⁴⁴ In April 2010, the 42-year-old theologian and, since 2003, editor in chief of the staunchly orthodox Catholic theological periodical *Theologisches*, viewed as

a staunchly “traditional” celibate (not a priest), caused a media stir as he suddenly outed himself as an active gay.

⁴⁵ Referring to the adage “birds of a feather flock together.”

⁴⁶ To his category belonged about 15% of two hundred of my therapy clients; but since most of these are religiously motivated, this is a positive selection and not representative of the total SSA population.

⁴⁷ This information is primarily according to trustworthy and knowledgeable informants. This supposition is supported not only by the reality that for years, homosexual bishops have been appointed despite their known same-sex inclinations or sympathies, but also by the persistent inactivity in the face of various scandals related to homosexuality in the Church, be it homosexual molestations by priests and some bishops or endorsement of prelates of the gay ideology. Two small illustrations of the latter: the Most Rev. Jacques Gaillot, bishop of Évreux (France), although summoned in 1995 to retreat, was nevertheless not suspended from his functions; in 2005 he publicly declared “homo marriage” a human right. On May 6, 2004, Vatican radio quoted the papal nuncio in Spain, Archbishop Manuel Monteiro de Castro, as admonishing the Spanish bishops to respond to the “new political situation in Spain” and realize that there are other forms of living together than between man and woman, i.e., same-sex partnerships which “it is good to be recognized.” If there is no protection from high places, it is implausible that such gay-promoting statements will openly be made by men in functions of high responsibility.

⁴⁸ Nasini, *Um espinho na carne*, 115.

⁴⁹ The publication of the English bishops (2008) is short of pushing the gay ideology, the American *Always Our Children*, by adopting the victim-ideology, creates an atmosphere of false sentimentality. The (unpublished) directives for the German bishops (1999) for the selection of candidates for the priesthood is ambiguous and leaves all options open. Declaration of the English bishops’ conference, “What Is Life Like if You or Someone in Your Family Is Gay or Lesbian in Their Sexual Orientation? . . . and What Can Your Parish Family Do to Make a Difference?” <http://www.everybodyswelcome.org.uk/docs/gay.pdf>. On the directives of the German bishops, see Katholische Nachrichten Agentur, *Die Tagespost*, August 24, 2004.

⁵⁰ Fr. A. Serra, honorary member of the papal Academy for Life and former professor of genetics at the Gregoriana University at Rome, wrote an article in the Jesuit periodical *Civiltà Cattolica* (prestigious among priests and Catholic intellectuals), misrepresenting research data as indicating a biological basis for homosexuality. Tellingly, the periodical refused the debate on the article’s misleading affirmations. A. Serra, *Sessualità: Scienza, sapienza, società* (Sexuality: Science, Wisdom, Society) *La Civiltà Cattolica* 155 (2004): 220–234.

⁵¹ At least until the end of 2010, a convent of Dominicans in Germany referred young people with homosexual problems to gay activities (<http://www.medrum.de/content/braunschweiger-dominikanerkloster-entfernt-schwulensex-seite>). If there is a protest, it comes from lay people, not from the bishop of the diocese.

⁵² P. Sullins, “American Catholics and Same-Sex ‘Marriage,’” *Catholic Social Science Review* 15 (2010): 97–123.

⁵³ As recently as 1998, only 36% of a sample of representatives of the priests of the Brazilian dioceses in a national committee stated they wanted the celibacy requirement to stay (Nasini, *Um espinho na carne*).

⁵⁴ "Take what is beautiful and attractive and shrink from what is stern and painful." John Henry Newman, *Sermons Bearing on Subjects of the Day* (1857), 116.

⁵⁵ An important factor undermining the resistance of many was the normalization of masturbation. Giving up struggling against this habit has often been the first step towards seeking contacts.

⁵⁶ R. Norton, *The Myth of the Modern Homosexual* (London/Washington: Cassell, 1977) gives evidence of the relation between priesthood functions and homosexuality in pagan and Eastern (Japanese, Indian, Chinese) cultures. St. Augustine comments on the ancient Roman temple cults "the effeminate are consecrated," and on "the 'Great Mother' of the gods with her thousands of male effeminates [= gays], who make public professions of themselves" (*The City of God Against the Pagans*, bk. 2, VII; and bk. 7, XXVI, respectively). The overrepresentation of homosexually oriented vicars, ministers, and theology students in Protestant denominations such as the German (Lutheran) Evangelical Church, the various Dutch Reformed Churches, and the Anglican Church is well-known and undisputed in the northern European countries; I myself have long-time, first-hand experience on this issue and much information from Protestant clergymen, homosexually as well as non-homosexually inclined. Evidence from the American ex-gay movement points to the same.

⁵⁷ "Visio Wettini" (The vision of Wetti), in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, ed. Ernst Dümmler (1894), 267–275, 301–303.

⁵⁸ Saint Catherine of Siena, *Dialogo della divina Provvidenza* (Bologna: Edizioni Studio Domenicano, 2001), 124th dialogue.

⁵⁹ Congregation for Catholic Education, *Guidelines for the Use of Psychology in the Admission and Formation of Candidates for the Priesthood* (2008), n. 10, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccatheduc/documents/rc_con_ccatheduc_doc_20080628_orientamenti_en.html.

⁶⁰ According to my experience.

⁶¹ Personal communication to this author.

⁶² For example, priests with SSA problems were described by colleagues as "sexually obsessed; thoroughly immature. Discontented with themselves, always in search of something. Without self-confidence and self-respect, they are sick people who may blackmail, lie, and conceal. They often victimize themselves and feel discriminated upon and locked out" (Nasini, *Um espinho na carne*, 115). R.P. Fitzgibbon and P. Rudegear noticed in homosexually active priests in treatment: "denial of sin," childhood traumatization, "lack of male confidence, sadness, anger," "seeing their own pleasure as the highest end," and rationalization of their desires ("A Letter to the Bishops," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 103 [November 2002]: 53–61).

⁶³ Pope Benedict XVI, meeting with the clergy, Warsaw Cathedral, May 25, 2006, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2006/may/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20060525_poland-clergy_en.html.